

SUMS OF COMMUTATORS IN IDEALS AND MODULES OF TYPE II FACTORS

K.J. DYKEMA AND N.J. KALTON

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a factor of type II_∞ or II_1 having separable predual and let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be the algebra of affiliated τ -measureable operators. We characterize the commutator space $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ for sub- $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$ -bimodules $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra of type II_∞ having separable predual. We will study the commutator structure of ideals of $\mathcal{M}$ and, more generally, of modules of operators affiliated to $\mathcal{M}$.

Fix a faithful semifinite trace τ on $\mathcal{M}$, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be represented on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Segal [23] introduced measurability for unbounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$ affiliated to $\mathcal{M}$. Later Nelson [21], in a slightly different approach, defined the completion $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to a notion of convergence in measure, and showed that the operations on $\mathcal{M}$ extend to make $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ a topological $*$ -algebra. He also showed that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is the set of all τ -*measurable* operators, i.e. the closed, densely defined, possibly unbounded operators T on $\mathcal{H}$, affiliated with $\mathcal{M}$, such that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a projection $E \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\tau(1 - E) < \epsilon$ and with TE bounded. Note that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is defined independently of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ on which $\mathcal{M}$ acts, but is then characterized in terms of operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Nelson's work was done in the more general context of a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ equipped with a fixed finite or semifinite faithful normal trace. (See [4] for a proof that Segal's and Nelson's definitions are equivalent in II_∞ factors.)

We consider subspaces $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ that are globally invariant under left and right multiplication by elements from $\mathcal{M}$. These are thus sub- $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$ -bimodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$; for brevity we will call them *submodules* of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Note that if such a submodule $\mathcal{I}$ is actually contained in $\mathcal{M}$, then it is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{M}$. Submodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ are analogues in the type II_∞ context of ideals of $B(\mathcal{H})$ in the type I context. The submodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ can be classified in terms of the singular numbers of their elements, analogously to Calkin's classification [3] of the ideals of $B(\mathcal{H})$. If $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $t > 0$, the t -th singular number of T is

$$\mu_t(T) = \inf \left(\{ \|T(1 - E)\| : E \in \mathcal{M} \text{ a projection with } \tau(E) \leq t \} \cup \{0\} \right), \quad (1.1)$$

Date: 21 April, 2003.

K.J.D. supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0070558. N.J.K. supported in part by NSF grant DMS-9870027.

and we denote by $\mu(T)$ the function $t \mapsto \mu_t(T)$. If $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is a submodule, we set

$$\mu(\mathcal{I}) = \{\mu(T) \mid T \in \mathcal{I}\}$$

and we call $\mu(\mathcal{I})$ the *characteristic set* of $\mathcal{I}$. The aforementioned classification is the bijection $\mathcal{I} \mapsto \mu(\mathcal{I})$ from the set of all submodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ to the set of all characteristic sets, where, abstractly, a characteristic set is a set of decreasing functions on $(0, \infty)$ satisfying certain properties. Several authors have used singular numbers to characterize ideals of $\mathcal{M}$ and modules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ (see [5], [24], [26] and [6]), and the full classification result was derived by Guido and Isola in [15].

One interesting facet of submodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is that their classification involves both asymptotics at infinity (the rate of decay of $\mu_t(T)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$) and asymptotics at zero (the rate of increase of $\mu_t(T)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$).

We consider additive commutators $[A, B] = AB - BA$ of elements of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and study the commutator spaces

$$[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}] = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n [A_k, B_k] \mid n \in \mathbf{N}, A_k \in \mathcal{I}, B_k \in \mathcal{J} \right\}$$

of submodules $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Note $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}] \subseteq \mathcal{IJ}$, where $\mathcal{IJ}$ is the submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ spanned by all products AB with $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \in \mathcal{J}$. Using properties of singular numbers (which are reviewed in §2), one easily shows that $\mu(\mathcal{IJ})$ is the set of all decreasing functions $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ bounded above by products gh with $g \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$ and $h \in \mu(\mathcal{J})$. Since an element of $\mathcal{IJ}$ belongs to $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ if and only if its real and imaginary parts belong to $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$, to characterize $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ it will suffice to describe the normal elements of it. This we do as follows: given a normal element $T \in \mathcal{IJ}$, let $E_{|T|}$ denote the spectral measure of the positive part $|T|$ of T . Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ if and only if there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{IJ})$ such that

$$|\tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_r(T)))| \leq rh(r) + sh(s) \quad (1.2)$$

for all $0 < r < s < \infty$. This is analogous, though for asymptotics in both directions, to the characterization of commutator spaces for ideals of $B(\mathcal{H})$ found in [7] (see also [17] for the earlier result in the case of the trace-class operators). Our proof relies on a result of Fack and de la Harpe [10], expressing any trace-zero element of a II_1 -factor as a sum of a fixed number of commutators of elements whose norms are controlled. A corollary of our characterization is

$$[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}] = [\mathcal{IJ}, \mathcal{M}]$$

for any submodules $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. We also give a characterization of $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ for T normal that considers separately the asymptotics at 0 and at ∞ .

As an alternative to using the characteristic set $\mu(\mathcal{I})$ of a submodule $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ for the classification of submodules, one can use the corresponding rearrangement invariant function space $S(\mathcal{I})$, which is the set of all measurable functions $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ such that the decreasing rearrangement of the absolute value of f lies in $\mu(\mathcal{I})$. Then every normal element $T \in \mathcal{I}$ gives rise to a unique (up to rearrangement) function $f_T \in S(\mathcal{I})$ defined as follows: Fix any measure preserving transformation from $(0, \infty)$ with Lebesgue measure to the disjoint union of four copies of $(0, \infty)$ with Lebesgue

measure, in order to define the measurable function $g_1 \oplus g_2 \oplus g_3 \oplus g_4 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, given measurable functions $g_j : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$. Now let $f_T = f_1 \oplus (-f_2) \oplus (if_3) \oplus (-if_4) \in S(\mathcal{I})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(t) &= \mu_t((\operatorname{Re} T)_+) & f_2(t) &= \mu_t((\operatorname{Re} T)_-) \\ f_3(t) &= \mu_t((\operatorname{Im} T)_+) & f_4(t) &= \mu_t((\operatorname{Im} T)_-) , \end{aligned}$$

with $\operatorname{Re} T = (T + T^*)/2 = (\operatorname{Re} T)_+ - (\operatorname{Re} T)_-$, where $(\operatorname{Re} T)_+$ and $(\operatorname{Re} T)_-$ are commuting positive operators whose product is zero, and similarly for $\operatorname{Im} T = (T - T^*)/2i = (\operatorname{Im} T)_+ - (\operatorname{Im} T)_-$. Then in the case when $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$ for all elements $T \in \mathcal{IJ}$, the condition (1.2) above for $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ with T normal can be rephrased in terms of f_T and is seen to be equivalent to the condition found in [12] for f_T to belong to the kernel of every symmetric functional on $S(\mathcal{IJ})$. Thus, our main result can be seen as a noncommutative analogue of this result from [12]. See also [6] for related results on Banach symmetric functions spaces and the corresponding submodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$.

In the case of a II_1 -factor $\mathcal{M}$, we give an analogous characterization of the commutator spaces $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ for submodules $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$.

In the case of ideals in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ it was shown in [18] that for quasi-Banach ideals $\mathcal{I}$ the subspace $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})]$ can be characterized purely in spectral terms (see also [17] for an earlier result in this direction). More generally this result was established for the class of geometrically stable ideals. This means that for such ideals if two operators S, T in $\mathcal{I}$ have the same spectrum (counting algebraic multiplicities) and $S \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})]$ then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})]$. This was known for hermitian operators (and hence normal operators) from the results in [7], but is generally false (see [8]). We study the same phenomenon in type II_∞ -factors. In this case, since we need a notion corresponding to multiplicity we employ the Brown measure [2] as a substitute for the notion of spectrum. The Brown measure of an operator is a measure with support contained in its spectrum. It is, however, only defined for certain special types of operators. Nevertheless we obtain a quite satisfactory analogue of the result of [18]. If $\mathcal{I}$ is a geometrically stable submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $T \in \mathcal{I}$ admits a Brown measure ν_T then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if there is a positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}$ so that

$$\left| \int_{r < |z| \leq s} z \, d\nu_T(z) \right| \leq r\tau(E_V(r, \infty)) + s\tau(E_V(s, \infty)) \quad 0 < r < s < \infty.$$

This condition depends only on the Brown measure associated to T .

The paper is organized as follows: In §2, we recall some facts about singular numbers of elements of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. In §3, we describe the classification of submodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ when $\mathcal{M}$ is a type II_∞ or II_1 factor with separable predual. In §4, we prove the main results characterizing $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$. In §5, we give a characterization of $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ in the II_∞ case, separating the asymptotics at 0 and ∞ . Results on the Brown measure are discussed in §6.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON SINGULAR NUMBERS

If $\mathcal{M}$ is a von Neumann algebra with a fixed finite or semifinite normal trace τ , then the singular numbers (sometimes called generalized singular numbers) of elements of $\mathcal{M}$ and more generally of τ -measureable operators affiliated to $\mathcal{M}$ have been understood for many years; see, for example, [20], [14], [9] and [11]. In this section, we review these concepts and some results, introduce the notation we will use throughout the paper and prove a technical result that will be of use later.

Recall that t -th singular number of $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is defined for $t > 0$ by (1.1). Since T is τ -measureable, we have $0 \leq \mu_t(T) < +\infty$. We will also use the convention $\mu_0(T) = \|T\|$, where $\|T\| = \infty$ if $T \notin \mathcal{M}$. Note that $t \mapsto \mu_t(T)$ is a nonincreasing function from $[0, \infty)$ into $[0, \infty]$. If τ is a finite trace, then by our convention that $\tau(1) = 1$ we have $\mu_t(T) = 0$ whenever $t \geq 1$. We will use the following properties of singular numbers; see [9] or [11] for proofs.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra with a distinguished finite or semifinite normal faithful trace, let $S, T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $s, t \geq 0$. Then*

- (i) $\mu_t(T) = \mu_t(T^*) = \mu_t(|T|)$,
- (ii) $\mu_{s+t}(S+T) \leq \mu_s(S) + \mu_t(T)$,
- (iii) $\mu_{s+t}(ST) \leq \mu_s(S)\mu_t(T)$,
- (iv) if $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\mu_t(ATB) \leq \|A\|\|B\|\mu_t(T)$.

Moreover,

- (iv) the function $[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto \mu_t(T) \in [0, \infty]$ is continuous from the right.

Given $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, let $A \mapsto E_{|T|}(A)$ be the projection-valued spectral measure of the positive part $|T|$ of T . (To avoid clutter, when A is an interval we will frequently omit to write parenthesis, writing just $E_{|T|}A$.)

Proposition 2.2 ([11], 2.2). *For $t \geq 0$ we have*

$$\mu_t(T) = \inf \left(\{s \geq 0 \mid \tau(E_{|T|}(s, \infty)) \leq t\} \cup \{\infty\} \right) \quad (2.1)$$

and the infimum is attained, giving

$$\tau(E_{|T|}(\mu_t(T), \infty)) \leq t \quad (2.2)$$

whenever $\mu_t(T) < \infty$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a nonatomic von Neumann algebra with a normal faithful semifinite trace τ , let $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and let $x \in \mathbf{R}$, $x \geq 0$. Then*

$$\tau(E_{|T|}(x, \infty)) = \inf \left(\{s \geq 0 \mid \mu_s(T) \leq x\} \cup \{\infty\} \right), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\tau(E_{|T|}[x, \infty)) = \sup \left(\{s \geq 0 \mid \mu_s(T) \geq x\} \cup \{0\} \right), \quad (2.4)$$

and the infimum in (2.3) is attained.

Proof. The infimum in (2.3) is attained because $s \mapsto \mu_s(T)$ is continuous from the right. If $a = \tau(E_{|T|}(x, \infty)) < \infty$, then, since $\|T(1 - E_{|T|}(x, \infty))\| \leq x$, we have $\mu_a(T) \leq x$, proving $\geq$ in (2.3). On the other hand, if $\mu_s(T) \leq x < \infty$, then using (2.2) we have

$$\tau(E_{|T|}(x, \infty)) \leq \tau(E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty)) \leq s,$$

proving $\leq$ in (2.3).

If $s < \tau(E_{|T|}[x, \infty))$, then for any projection $P \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\tau(P) = s$, we have $(1 - P) \wedge E_{|T|}[x, \infty) \neq 0$. Hence $\|T(1 - P)\| \geq x$. Therefore $\mu_s(T) \geq x$, which proves $\leq$ in (2.4). If $\tau(E_{|T|}[x, \infty)) < s' < \infty$, then since $[x, \infty) = \bigcap_{0 < r < x} (r, \infty)$, there is $r < x$ such that $\tau(E_{|T|}(r, \infty)) \leq s'$. But then $\mu_{s'}(T) \leq r < x$, which implies $s' \geq \sup(\{s \geq 0 \mid \mu_s(T) \geq x\} \cup \{0\})$. This proves $\geq$ in (2.4). $\square$

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a II_∞ -factor and let us introduce the natural notation $\oplus$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ consists of (in general unbounded) operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, by choosing an isomorphism $\mathcal{H} \cong \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$, we may realize $\overline{\mathcal{M}} \oplus \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ as a subalgebra of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ in such a way that $\tau(S \oplus T) = \tau(S) + \tau(T)$ whenever S and T are in $L^1(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Thus for $S, T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, $S \oplus T$ defines an element of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ uniquely up to conjugation by a unitary in $\mathcal{M}$. Since $U^*AU = A + [AU, U^*]$ whenever U is unitary and $A \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, if $S, T \in \mathcal{I}$ for any submodule $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, the direct sum $S \oplus T$ is defined uniquely up to addition of a commutator from $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$. Moreover, we have $\mathcal{I} \oplus \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and for every $T \in \mathcal{I}$ we get

$$T \oplus 0 \in T + [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$$

by using an appropriate nonunitary isometry in $\mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $S, T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and let $a \geq 0$. Then*

$$\mu_a(S \oplus T) = \inf\{\max(\mu_b(S), \mu_c(T)) \mid b, c \geq 0, b + c = a\}.$$

Proof. The case $a = 0$ is straightforward, so we may assume $a > 0$. It is clearly equivalent to show

$$\mu_a(S \oplus T) = \inf\{\max(\mu_b(S), \mu_c(T)) \mid b, c \geq 0, b + c \leq a\}. \quad (2.5)$$

Given $b, c \geq 0$ such that $b + c \leq a$, by (2.2) we have

$$\tau(E_{|S|}(\mu_b(S), \infty) \oplus E_{|T|}(\mu_c(T), \infty)) \leq b + c \leq a,$$

so using the definition (1.1) of singular numbers, we get

$$\mu_a(S \oplus T) \leq \|SE_{|S|}[0, \mu_b(S)] \oplus TE_{|T|}[0, \mu_c(T)]\| \leq \max(\mu_b(S), \mu_c(T)).$$

This shows $\leq$ in (2.5). For the reverse inclusion, by (2.1) we have

$$\mu_a(S \oplus T) = \inf\{r \geq 0 \mid \tau(E_{|S \oplus T|}(r, \infty)) \leq a\}.$$

But

$$E_{|S \oplus T|}(r, \infty) = E_{|S| \oplus |T|}(r, \infty) = E_{|S|}(r, \infty) \oplus E_{|T|}(r, \infty),$$

so

$$\mu_a(S \oplus T) = \inf\{r \geq 0 \mid \tau(E_{|S|}(r, \infty)) + \tau(E_{|T|}(r, \infty)) \leq a\}.$$

By Lemma 2.3, if $b = \tau(E_{|S|}(r, \infty))$ and $c = \tau(E_{|T|}(r, \infty))$, then $\mu_b(S) \leq r$ and $\mu_c(T) \leq r$. This implies $\geq$ in (2.5). $\square$

The next lemma can be described as mashing the atoms of $E_{|T|}$. It is both straightforward and similar to [15, Lemma 1.8]. However, for completeness, we include a proof.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra without minimal projections and with a distinguished semifinite normal faithful trace τ . Let $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Then there is a family $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of projections in $\mathcal{M}$ such that for all s and t ,*

- (i) $s \leq t$ implies $P_s \leq P_t$,
- (ii) $\tau(P_t) = t$,
- (iii) P_t and $|T|$ commute, and if T is normal then P_t and T commute,
- (iv) $E_{|T|}(\mu_t(T), \infty) \leq P_t \leq E_{|T|}[\mu_t(T), \infty)$,
- (v) if $x > 0$, then $E_{|T|}(x, \infty) = P_y$, where $y = \inf\{t > 0 \mid \mu_t(T) \leq x\}$.

Furthermore, suppose $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$. Then, letting F be the projection-valued Borel measure in $\mathcal{M}$ supported on $(0, \infty)$ and satisfying $F((a, b)) = P_b - P_a$, we have

$$|T| = \int_{(0, \infty)} \mu_t(T) dF(t).$$

Proof. If T is not normal, then we may replace T by $|T|$, so assume T is normal. Set $P_t = E_{|T|}(\mu_t(T), \infty)$ whenever $E_{|T|}(\{\mu_t(T)\}) = 0$. For these values of t , it follows from Lemma 2.3 that $\tau(P_t) = t$. The set

$$\mathcal{E} = \{E_{|T|}(\{\mu_t(T)\}) \mid t > 0\}$$

is finite or countable. We index $\mathcal{E}$ by letting I be a set and $I \ni i \mapsto t(i) \in [0, \infty)$ be an injective map such that

$$\mathcal{E} = \{0\} \cup \{E_{|T|}(\{\mu_{t(i)}(T)\}) \mid i \in I\},$$

$E_{|T|}(\{\mu_{t(i)}(T)\}) \neq 0$ and

$$t(i) = \inf\{s \mid \mu_s(T) = \mu_{t(i)}(T)\}.$$

Let $a_i = \tau(E_{|T|}(\{\mu_{t(i)}(T)\}))$.

Fix $i \in I$. Applying the spectral theorem to the normal operator $TE_{|T|}(\{\mu_{t(i)}(T)\})$ and putting an atomless resolution of the identity under any of its atoms, we find a family $(Q_r)_{0 \leq r < a_i}$ of projections in $\mathcal{M}$ such that

- (1) $r_1 \leq r_2$ implies $Q_{r_1} \leq Q_{r_2}$,
- (2) $\tau(Q_r) = r$,
- (3) $Q_r T = T Q_r$,
- (4) $Q_r \leq E_{|T|}(\{\mu_{t(i)}(T)\})$.

Let

$$P_{t(i)+r} = E_{|T|}(\mu_{t(i)}(T), \infty) + Q_r$$

for all $r \in [0, a_i)$. If $a_i \neq \infty$ then set $P_{t(i)+a_i} = E_{|T|}[\mu_{t(i)}(T), \infty)$. Now it is easily seen that the family $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies (i)–(v).

Suppose $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$ and let

$$S = \int_{(0, \infty)} \mu_t(T) dF(t).$$

Clearly $S \geq 0$. In order to show $S = |T|$, it will suffice to show $E_S(x, \infty) = E_{|T|}(x, \infty)$ for all $x > 0$. We have

$$E_S(x, \infty) = F(\{t > 0 \mid \mu_t(T) > x\}).$$

But $\{t > 0 \mid \mu_t(T) > x\} = (0, y)$ where

$$y = \sup\{t > 0 \mid \mu_t(T) > x\} = \inf\{t > 0 \mid \mu_t(T) \leq x\}.$$

From Lemma 2.3, $y = \tau(E_{|T|}(x, \infty))$ and, furthermore, $\mu_y(T) \leq x$. By construction,

$$F((0, y)) = P_y = E_{|T|}(x, \infty).$$

□

3. CLASSIFICATION OF MODULES OF A TYPE II FACTOR

Let $D^+(0, \infty)$, respectively $D^+(0, 1)$, denote the cone of all decreasing (i.e. nonincreasing) functions f from the interval $(0, \infty)$, respectively $(0, 1)$, into $[0, \infty)$ that are continuous from the right.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be either $D^+(0, \infty)$ or $D^+(0, 1)$. A subset Λ of $\mathcal{D}$ is called a *hereditary subcone* of $\mathcal{D}$ if

- (i) $f, g \in \Lambda$ implies $f + g \in \Lambda$,
- (ii) $f \in \Lambda$, $g \in D^+(0, \infty)$ and $g \leq f$ imply $g \in \Lambda$.

The subset $\Lambda \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is called a *characteristic set in $\mathcal{D}$* if it is a hereditary subcone and if

- (iii) $f \in \Lambda$ implies $D_2 f \in \Lambda$,

where $D_2 f(t) = f(t/2)$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be either a type II_∞ factor with a fixed semifinite normal trace τ or a type II_1 factor with tracial state τ . Let $\mathcal{D}$ be $D^+(0, \infty)$ if $\mathcal{M}$ is type II_∞ and $D^+(0, 1)$ if $\mathcal{M}$ is type II_1 . We will recall from [15] the classification of submodules of the algebra $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ of τ -measurable operators in terms of characteristic sets in $\mathcal{D}$.

For $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, let $\mu(T) \in \mathcal{D}$ be the function which at t takes the value $\mu_t(T)$ of the t -th singular number of T . Given a submodule $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, let

$$\mu(\mathcal{I}) = \{\mu(T) : T \in \mathcal{I}\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}.$$

Proposition 3.2 ([15]). *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a factor of type II_∞ or II_1 . Then the map $\mathcal{I} \mapsto \mu(\mathcal{I})$ is a bijection from the set of all submodules of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ onto the set of all characteristic sets in $\mathcal{D}$.*

Remark 3.3. A few well known observations are perhaps in order. If $\mathcal{M}$ is type II_∞ , then $\mu(\mathcal{M})$ is the set of all bounded functions in $D^+(0, \infty)$. Thus the smallest nonzero ideal of $\mathcal{M}$ is the set $\mathcal{F}$ of all τ -finite rank operators in $\mathcal{M}$, where an operator T has τ -finite rank if $T = ET$ for some projection $E \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ with $\tau(E) < \infty$; the largest proper ideal of $\mathcal{M}$ is the set $\mathcal{K}$ of all τ -compact operators in $\mathcal{M}$, where (cf [24]) an operator T is τ -compact if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{M}$ is type II_1 , then $\mu(\mathcal{M})$ is the set of all bounded functions in $D^+(0, 1)$, and $\mathcal{M}$ itself has no proper nonzero ideals.

4. SUMS OF COMMUTATORS

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a von Neumann algebra without minimal projections and with a normal faithful semifinite trace τ . Let $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$. If $T = \sum_{i=1}^N [A_i, B_i]$ with $A_i, B_i \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, then*

$$|\tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_r(T)))| \leq rh(r) + sh(s) \quad (4.1)$$

whenever $0 < r < s < \infty$, where

$$h(t) = (8N + 2)\mu_t(T) + (16N + 4) \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_t(A_i)\mu_t(B_i).$$

Proof. We have $E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_r(T)) = F_s - F_r$ where $F_t = E_{|T|}(\mu_t(T), \infty)$. Note

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(1 - F_s)\| &\leq \mu_s(T), & \tau(F_s) &\leq s, \\ \|T(1 - F_r)\| &\leq \mu_r(T), & \tau(F_r) &\leq r. \end{aligned}$$

We can find a projection $P \geq F_r$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\tau(P) \leq (4N + 1)r$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_i(1 - P)\| &\leq \mu_r(A_i), & \|(1 - P)A_i\| &\leq \mu_r(A_i), \\ \|B_i(1 - P)\| &\leq \mu_r(B_i), & \|(1 - P)B_i\| &\leq \mu_r(B_i), \end{aligned} \quad (1 \leq i \leq N).$$

Then we can find a projection $Q \geq F_s \vee P$ such that $\tau(Q) \leq (4N + 1)(r + s) \leq (8N + 2)s$ and such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_i(1 - Q)\| &\leq \mu_s(A_i), & \|(1 - Q)A_i\| &\leq \mu_s(A_i), \\ \|B_i(1 - Q)\| &\leq \mu_s(B_i), & \|(1 - Q)B_i\| &\leq \mu_s(B_i), \end{aligned} \quad (1 \leq i \leq N).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(T(F_s - F_r))| &\leq |\tau(T(Q - P))| + |\tau(T(Q - F_s))| + |\tau(T(P - F_r))| \\ &\leq |\tau(T(Q - P))| + (8N + 2)s\mu_s(T) + (4N + 1)r\mu_r(T). \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q - P$ is a finite projection and $T(Q - P)$ is bounded,

$$|\tau(T(Q - P))| = |\tau((Q - P)T(Q - P))| \leq \sum_{i=1}^N |\tau((Q - P)[A_i, B_i](Q - P))|.$$

Since also $A_i(Q - P)$, $(Q - P)A_i$, $B_i(Q - P)$ and $(Q - P)B_i$ are bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau((Q - P)[A_i, B_i](Q - P)) &= \tau((Q - P)A_i(1 - Q + P)B_i(Q - P)) \\ &\quad - \tau((Q - P)B_i(1 - Q + P)A_i(Q - P)). \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} &|\tau((Q - P)A_i(1 - Q + P)B_i(Q - P))| \\ &\leq |\tau((Q - P)A_i(1 - Q)B_i)| + |\tau(B_i(Q - P)A_iP)| \\ &\leq \tau(Q - P)\|A_i(1 - Q)\| \|(1 - Q)B_i\| + \tau(P)\|B_i(Q - P)\| \|(Q - P)A_i\| \\ &\leq (8N + 2)s\mu_s(A_i)\mu_s(B_i) + (4N + 1)r\mu_r(B_i)\mu_r(A_i), \end{aligned}$$

and also with A_i and B_i interchanged. Adding these several upper bounds gives (4.1). $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a II_∞ factor with a specified normal faithful semifinite trace τ . Let $h \in D^+(0, \infty)$ and suppose $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ is a normal operator satisfying*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0 \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$|\tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_r(T)))| \leq rh(r) + sh(s) \quad (0 < r < s < \infty). \quad (4.3)$$

Let Λ be the characteristic subset in $D^+(0, \infty)$ generated by h and $\mu(T)$. Then there are $X_1, \dots, X_{14} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_{14} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{14} [X_i, Y_i] \quad (4.4)$$

and $\mu(X_i) \in \Lambda$ for all i .

Proof. Let $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a family of projections obtained from Lemma 2.6. Assumption (4.2) implies $P_\infty T = T P_\infty = T$, where $P_\infty = \bigvee_{t \geq 0} P_t$. Let $P[s, t] = P_t - P_s$ when $s < t$, let

$$\alpha_n = 2^{-n} \tau(T P[2^n, 2^{n+1}]) \quad (n \in \mathbf{Z})$$

and let

$$A = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} \alpha_n P[2^n, 2^{n+1}].$$

Note that $T - A = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} S_n$ where $S_n = (T - A)P[2^n, 2^{n+1}]$ is an element of the II_1 -factor $P[2^n, 2^{n+1}] \mathcal{M} P[2^n, 2^{n+1}]$ having zero trace. By [10, Thm. 2.3], there are $X_1^{(n)}, \dots, X_{10}^{(n)}, Y_1^{(n)}, \dots, Y_{10}^{(n)} \in P[2^n, 2^{n+1}] \mathcal{M} P[2^n, 2^{n+1}]$ such that

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{10} [X_i^{(n)}, Y_i^{(n)}]$$

and for all i , $\|X_i^{(n)}\| \leq 12\|S_n\|$ and $\|Y_i^{(n)}\| \leq 2$. We therefore have

$$T - A = \sum_{i=1}^{10} [X_i, Y_i],$$

where

$$X_i = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} X_i^{(n)}, \quad Y_i = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} Y_i^{(n)}.$$

Clearly $Y_i \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $\|X_i^{(n)}\| \leq 12\|T_n\| \leq 12\mu_{2^n}(T)$, it follows that $\mu_{2^{n+1}}(X_i) \leq 12\mu_{2^n}(T)$, and therefore that $\mu(X_i) \in \Lambda$.

It remains to show that A is a sum of four commutators. For $t > 0$ let $F_t = E_{|T|}(\mu_t(T), \infty)$. For $k, \ell \in \mathbf{Z}$, $k < \ell$, using the hypothesis (4.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=k}^{\ell-1} 2^j \alpha_j \right| &= |\tau(T(P_{2^\ell} - P_{2^k}))| \\ &\leq |\tau(T(F_{2^\ell} - F_{2^k}))| + |\tau(T(P_{2^k} - F_{2^k}))| + |\tau(T(P_{2^\ell} - F_{2^\ell}))| \\ &\leq 2^k h(2^k) + 2^\ell h(2^\ell) + 2^k \mu_{2^k}(T) + 2^\ell \mu_{2^\ell}(T). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\phi(t) = h(t) + \mu_t(T)$, we have $\phi \in \Lambda$ and

$$\left| \sum_{j=k}^{\ell-1} 2^j \alpha_j \right| \leq 2^k \phi(2^k) + 2^\ell \phi(2^\ell). \quad (4.5)$$

We will now write $\operatorname{Re} A$ as a sum of two commutators. Note that inequality (4.5) continues to hold when each α_j is replaced by $\operatorname{Re} \alpha_j$. We will find real numbers β_n satisfying

$$\operatorname{Re} \alpha_n = \beta_{n-1} - 2\beta_n, \quad |\beta_n| \leq \phi(2^n), \quad (n \in \mathbf{Z}). \quad (4.6)$$

Treating β_0 as the independent variable, solving the equality in (4.6) recursively yields

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{-m} &= 2^m \beta_0 + 2^{m-1} \sum_{j=-m+1}^0 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \\ \beta_m &= 2^{-m} \beta_0 - 2^{-m-1} \sum_{j=1}^m 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \end{aligned} \quad (m \geq 1).$$

The condition $|\beta_n| \leq \phi(2^n)$ for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ is thus equivalent to the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} -2^{-m} \phi(2^{-m}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-m+1}^0 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j &\leq \beta_0 \leq 2^{-m} \phi(2^{-m}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-m+1}^0 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \\ -2^m \phi(2^m) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j &\leq \beta_0 \leq 2^m \phi(2^m) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \end{aligned}$$

for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. The existence of a real number β_0 satisfying all of these relations is equivalent to the following four inequalities holding for all integers $k, \ell \geq 1$:

$$-2^{-k} \phi(2^{-k}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-k+1}^0 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \leq 2^{-\ell} \phi(2^{-\ell}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-\ell+1}^0 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \quad (4.7)$$

$$-2^{-k} \phi(2^{-k}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-k+1}^0 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \leq 2^\ell \phi(2^\ell) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^\ell 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \quad (4.8)$$

$$-2^k \phi(2^k) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \leq 2^{-\ell} \phi(2^{-\ell}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-\ell+1}^0 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \quad (4.9)$$

$$-2^k \phi(2^k) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \leq 2^\ell \phi(2^\ell) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^\ell 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j. \quad (4.10)$$

But these inequalities are easily verified. For example, (4.7) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-\ell+1}^{-k} 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \leq 2^{-\ell} \phi(2^{-\ell}) + 2^{-k} \phi(2^{-k}) \quad \text{if } k < \ell \quad (4.11)$$

$$-2^{-k} \phi(2^{-k}) - 2^{-\ell} \phi(2^{-\ell}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-k+1}^{-\ell} 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j \quad \text{if } k > \ell, \quad (4.12)$$

while (4.8) is equivalent to

$$-2^{-k} \phi(2^{-k}) - 2^{-\ell} \phi(2^{-\ell}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=-k+1}^{\ell} 2^j \operatorname{Re} \alpha_j; \quad (4.13)$$

keeping in mind that ϕ is nonnegative and nonincreasing, inequalities (4.11)–(4.13) follow directly from (4.5). Inequalities (4.9) and (4.10) are verified for all k and ℓ similarly. We have succeeded in proving the existence of β_n satisfying (4.6).

Now let $V_n, W_n \in \mathcal{M}$, ($n \in \mathbf{Z}$), be such that

$$\begin{aligned} V_n^* V_n &= P[2^{n-1}, 2^n], & V_n V_n^* &= P[2^n, 2^n + 2^{n-1}], \\ W_n^* W_n &= P[2^{n-1}, 2^n], & W_n W_n^* &= P[2^n + 2^{n-1}, 2^{n+1}] \end{aligned}$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} X_{11} &= \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} \beta_{n-1} V_n & Y_{11} &= \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} V_n \\ X_{12} &= \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} \beta_{n-1} W_n & Y_{12} &= \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} W_n. \end{aligned}$$

Then $X_i \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, $\mu(X_i) \in \Lambda$ and $Y_i \in \mathcal{M}$ ($i = 11, 12$), and

$$[X_{11}, Y_{11}] + [X_{12}, Y_{12}] = \operatorname{Re} A.$$

We may do the same for $\operatorname{Im} A$. □

We now prove an analogous result in a II_1 -factor.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a II_1 -factor with tracial state τ and let $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a normal operator. Suppose there is $h \in D^+(0, 1)$ such that*

$$|\tau(T E_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| \leq r h(r), \quad (0 < r \leq 1). \quad (4.14)$$

Let Λ be the characteristic set in $D^+(0, 1)$ generated by h and $\mu(T)$. Then there are $X_1, \dots, X_{12} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_{12} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{12} [X_i, Y_i] \quad (4.15)$$

and $\mu(X_i) \in \Lambda$ for all i .

Proof. Lemma 2.6 (formally applied in $\mathcal{M} \otimes B(\mathcal{H})$, if we like) gives a family of projections $(P_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ satisfying (i)–(v) of that proposition. Let $P[s, t] = P_t - P_s$ ($s < t$), let

$$\alpha_n = \tau(TP[2^n, 2^{n+1}]) \quad (n \in \mathbf{Z}, n < 0)$$

and let

$$A = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} \alpha_n P[2^n, 2^{n+1}].$$

Applying the result of Fack and de la Harpe [10] as in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we can show

$$T - A = \sum_{i=1}^{10} [X_i, Y_i]$$

with $Y_i \in \mathcal{M}$, $X_i \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mu(X_i) \in \Lambda$. Letting $F_t = E_{|T|}(\mu_t(T), \infty)$ and using the hypothesis (4.14), for $n \in \mathbf{Z}$, $n \leq -1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=n}^{-1} 2^j \alpha_j \right| &= |\tau(T(1 - P_{2^n}))| \\ &\leq |\tau(T(1 - F_{2^n}))| + |\tau(T(P_{2^n} - F_{2^n}))| \\ &\leq 2^n h(2^n) + 2^n \mu_{2^n}(T). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\beta_{-1} = 0$ and

$$\beta_n = 2^{-n-1} \sum_{j=n+1}^{-1} 2^j \alpha_j \quad (n \in \mathbf{Z}, n \leq -2).$$

Then we have

$$|\beta_n| \leq \frac{1}{2} (h(2^{n+1}) + \mu_{2^{n+1}}(T))$$

and

$$\beta_{n-1} - 2\beta_n = \alpha_n, \quad (n \leq -1).$$

Let $V_n, W_n \in \mathcal{M}$ ($n \leq -1$) be as in the proof of Lemma 4.2 and let

$$\begin{aligned} X_{11} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} \beta_{n-1} V_n & Y_{11} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} V_n \\ X_{12} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} \beta_{n-1} W_n & Y_{12} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} W_n. \end{aligned}$$

Then $X_i \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, $\mu(X_i) \in \Lambda$ and $Y_i \in \mathcal{M}$ ($i = 11, 12$), and

$$[X_{11}, Y_{11}] + [X_{12}, Y_{12}] = A.$$

□

Proposition 4.4. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is a II_∞ -factor, then $[\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. Let $Q_0, Q_1, \dots$ be projections in $\mathcal{M}$, each equivalent to 1, and such that $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q_j = 1$. Let $V \in \mathcal{M}$ be such that

$$V^*V = 1, \quad VV^* = Q_0,$$

and let $W \in \mathcal{M}$ be such that

$$W^*W = 1, \quad WQ_jW^* = Q_{j+1} \quad (j \geq 0).$$

Given $T \in \mathcal{M}$, let

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} W^k V T V^* (W^*)^k.$$

Then $S \in \mathcal{M}$ and $[WS, W^*] + [TV^*, V] = T$. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a II_1 - or a II_{∞} -factor, and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be submodules. Then $[\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}] \subseteq [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$.*

Proof. If $X \in \mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}$ then $X = AB$ for $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \in \mathcal{J}$. This can be seen by writing $X = V|X|$ for a partial isometry V .

If also $Y \in \mathcal{M}$, then we have

$$[X, Y] = ABY - YAB = [A, BY] + [B, YA] \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}].$$

$\square$

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a type II_1 factor and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be submodules. Let $T \in \mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}$ be normal. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ if and only if there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J})$ such that*

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| \leq rh(r) \quad (0 < r < 1). \quad (4.16)$$

Proof. We may embed $\mathcal{M}$ in the II_{∞} factor $\mathcal{M} \otimes B(\mathcal{H})$ in a trace-preserving manner. If $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ then letting h be as in Lemma 4.1, we have $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J})$ with $h(1) = 0$. So taking $s = 1$ in equation (4.1), we get that h satisfies (4.16).

Now suppose $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J})$ is such that (4.16) holds. By Lemma 4.3, $T \in [\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}]$. Now Lemma 4.5 gives $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$. $\square$

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a type II_{∞} factor and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be submodules. Let $T \in \mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}$ be normal. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ if and only if there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J})$ such that*

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_r(T)))| \leq rh(r) + sh(s) \quad (0 < r < s < \infty). \quad (4.17)$$

Proof. If $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$ then by Lemma 4.1 there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J})$ satisfying (4.17).

Now suppose $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J})$ is such that (4.17) holds, and let us show $T \in [\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}]$. If $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$, then by Lemma 4.2 we have $T \in [\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}]$. Suppose $d := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) > 0$. If T is bounded, then by Proposition 4.4, $T \in [\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}] \subseteq [\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}]$. Suppose T is unbounded, let $a > 0$ be such that $\mu_a(T) > d$ and let $Q = E_{|T|}(\mu_a(T), \infty)$. Then $0 < \tau(Q) \leq a$, $QT = TQ$ and $\|(1 - Q)T\| \leq \mu_a(T)$. By Proposition 4.4, $(1 - Q)T \in [\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{M}]$. We have

$$\mu_t(QT) = \begin{cases} \mu_t(T) & \text{if } t < \tau(Q) \\ 0 & \text{if } t \geq \tau(Q). \end{cases}$$

Let $0 < r < s < \infty$. Then

$$(QT)E_{|QT|}(\mu_s(QT), \mu_r(QT)) = \begin{cases} TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_r(T)) & \text{if } s < \tau(Q) \\ TE_{|T|}(\mu_a(T), \mu_r(T)) & \text{if } r < \tau(Q) \leq s \\ 0 & \text{if } \tau(Q) \leq r. \end{cases}$$

If $r < \tau(Q) \leq s$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_a(T), \mu_r(T)))| &\leq rh(r) + ah(a) \leq rh(r) + ah(\tau(Q)) \\ &\leq rh(r) + s \frac{ah(\tau(Q))}{\tau(Q)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{h}(t) = \max(h(t), \frac{ah(\tau(Q))}{\tau(Q)})$. Then $\tilde{h} \in \mu(\mathcal{IJ})$ and we have

$$|\tau((QT)E_{|QT|}(\mu_s(QT), \mu_r(QT)))| \leq r\tilde{h}(r) + s\tilde{h}(s) \quad (0 < r < s < \infty).$$

Now Lemma 4.2 implies $QT \in [\mathcal{IJ}, \mathcal{M}]$.

We have shown $T \in [\mathcal{IJ}, \mathcal{M}]$. From Lemma 4.5, it follows that T belongs to $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}]$. $\square$

Corollary 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a type II_∞ factor or a type II_1 factor, and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be submodules. Then*

$$[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}] = [\mathcal{IJ}, \mathcal{M}].$$

5. SEPARATED ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOUR

Throughout this section, $\mathcal{M}$ will be a type II_∞ factor with semifinite trace τ and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ will be a nonzero submodule. Theorem 4.7 gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a normal operator T to belong to the commutator space $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$, but this condition considers simultaneous asymptotics at 0 and ∞ . In this section, we give an equivalent characterization which separates the behaviour at 0 and ∞ .

We have

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{fs} + \mathcal{I}_b \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{fs} &= \{T \in \mathcal{I} \mid \mu_s(T) = 0 \text{ for some } s > 0\} \\ \mathcal{I}_b &= \{T \in \mathcal{I} \mid \mu(T) \text{ bounded}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathcal{I}_{fs}$ is the set of $T \in \mathcal{I}$ that are supported on finite projections and $\mathcal{I}_b = \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{M}$. From (5.1), we have

$$[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]. \tag{5.2}$$

Given a normal element $T \in \mathcal{I}$, using a spectral projection of $|T|$ we can easily write $T = T_{fs} + T_b$ for some normal elements $T_{fs} \in \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ and $T_b \in \mathcal{I}_b$. It is our purpose to use Theorem 4.7 to give necessary and sufficient conditions for $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ in terms of T_{fs} and T_b .

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a submodule.*

- (i) Let $T \in \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ be normal. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ such that

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| \leq rh(r), \quad (0 < r < \infty). \quad (5.3)$$

- (ii) Let $T \in \mathcal{I}_b$ be normal. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty))| \leq sh(s), \quad (0 < s < \infty). \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. Let us prove (i). If $T \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$, then invoking Theorem 4.7 and letting $s \rightarrow \infty$, since $\mu_s(T)$ and $h(s)$ are eventually zero we obtain

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}(0, \mu_r(T)))| \leq rh(r),$$

which clearly implies (5.3). On the other hand, if (5.3) holds, then for $0 < r < s < \infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_r(T)))| &\leq |\tau(TE_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| + |\tau(TE_{|T|}[0, \mu_s(T)])| \\ &\leq rh(r) + sh(s), \end{aligned}$$

so $T \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$ by Theorem 4.7.

For (ii), if $T \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$, then invoking Theorem 4.7 and letting $r \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty))| = |\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \|T\|))| \leq sh(s),$$

since $h(r)$ stays bounded. Thus (5.4) holds. The argument that (5.4) implies $T \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ is similar to the analogous one in case (i). $\square$

Recall (Remark 3.3) $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the submodule (in fact, the ideal of $\mathcal{M}$) consisting of τ -finite rank bounded operators: $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}_{fs}$.

Corollary 5.2. $[\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{F} \cap \ker \tau$.

Proof. It will suffice to show that if $T = T^* \in \mathcal{F}$, then $T \in [\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $\tau(T) = 0$. Suppose $T \in [\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{M}]$ and let $h \in \mu(\mathcal{F})$ be such that (5.4) holds. Then $h(s) = 0$ and $\mu_s(T) = 0$ for some $s > 0$ and therefore $\tau(T) = \tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty)) = 0$.

Suppose $\tau(T) = 0$. Then $\mu_{s'}(T) = 0$ for some $s' > 0$. Let

$$h(s) = \begin{cases} \|T\| & s < s' \\ 0 & s \geq s' \end{cases}.$$

Then $h \in \mu(\mathcal{F})$. Using (2.2), we see that (5.4) holds when $0 < s < s'$, and it holds when $s \geq s'$ because $\tau(T) = 0$. $\square$

See Definition 2.4 for an explanation of the notation $\oplus$ used below.

Theorem 5.3. Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a nonzero submodule and let $T = T_{fs} + T_b \in \mathcal{I}$, where $T_{fs} \in \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ and $T_b \in \mathcal{I}_b$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$.
 (b) There is $X \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} T_b \oplus X &\in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \\ T_{fs} \oplus (-X) &\in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

(c) *There is $a \in \mathbf{C}$ such that whenever $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$, $\tau(X) \neq 0$ and $\tau(Y) \neq 0$,*

$$T_b \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(X)}X \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \quad (5.6)$$

$$T_{fs} \oplus \frac{-a}{\tau(Y)}Y \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] . \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. We first prove (a) $\implies$ (c). Suppose $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$. From (5.2), we have $T = \tilde{T}_{fs} + \tilde{T}_b$ for some $\tilde{T}_{fs} \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$ and $\tilde{T}_b \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$. Then using Corollary 5.2,

$$\tilde{T}_b - T_b = T_{fs} - \tilde{T}_{fs} \in \mathcal{I}_b \cap \mathcal{I}_{fs} = \mathcal{F} .$$

Let $a = \tau(\tilde{T}_b - T_b)$ and let $X \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\tau(X) \neq 0$. Then

$$\tilde{T}_b - T_b - \frac{a}{\tau(X)}X \in \mathcal{F} \cap \ker \tau = [\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{M}] \subseteq [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] .$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} T_b \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(X)}X &\in (T_b \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(X)}X \oplus 0) + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \\ &= (T_b \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(X)}X \oplus (\tilde{T}_b - T_b - \frac{a}{\tau(X)}X)) + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \\ &= (T_b \oplus (\tilde{T}_b - T_b)) + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \\ &= \tilde{T}_b + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \end{aligned}$$

and (5.6) holds. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{fs} \oplus \frac{-a}{\tau(Y)}Y &\in (T_{fs} \oplus \frac{-a}{\tau(Y)}Y \oplus 0) + [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \\ &= (T_{fs} \oplus \frac{-a}{\tau(Y)}Y \oplus (\tilde{T}_{fs} - T_{fs} + \frac{a}{\tau(Y)}Y)) + [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \\ &= (T_{fs} \oplus (\tilde{T}_{fs} - T_{fs})) + [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \\ &= \tilde{T}_{fs} + [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \end{aligned}$$

and (5.7) holds.

The implication (c) $\implies$ (b) is clear.

For (b) $\implies$ (a), assuming (5.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{fs} + T_b &\in T_{fs} \oplus T_b + [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] \\ &= T_{fs} \oplus (-X) \oplus X \oplus T_b + [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] . \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a nonzero submodule, let $T \in \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ be normal, $T \neq 0$ and let $a \in \mathbf{C}$. Let $P \in \mathcal{F}$ be a nonzero projection such that either T is unbounded or $\frac{|a|}{\tau(P)} < \|T\|$. Then*

$$T \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(P)}P \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$$

if and only if there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ such that

$$\forall r \in (0, 1), \quad |a + \tau(TE_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| \leq rh(r) . \quad (5.8)$$

Remark 5.5. As will be apparent from the proof, for any $r' > 0$ the existence of $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ such that (5.8) holds is equivalent to the existence of $h' \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ such that

$$\forall r \in (0, r'), \quad |a + \tau(T E_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| \leq r h'(r)$$

holds.

Proof Lemma 5.4. There is $r' > 0$ such that $\mu_r(T) > \frac{|a|}{\tau(P)}$ for all $r \in (0, r')$. Let $T' = T \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(P)}P$. Then (by Proposition 2.5), for $r \in (0, r')$ we have $\mu_r(T') = \mu_r(T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{|T'|}[0, \mu_r(T')] &= E_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)] \oplus P \\ \tau(T' E_{|T'|}[0, \mu_r(T')]) &= a + \tau(T E_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)]) . \end{aligned}$$

If $T' \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$, then by Lemma 5.1, there is $h' \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ such that

$$\forall r \in (0, r'), \quad |a + \tau(T E_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| \leq r h'(r) .$$

Since $d := \tau(E_{|T|}(0, \infty)) < \infty$ and

$$|\tau(T E_{|T|}[0, \mu_r(T)])| \leq \mu_r(T) d$$

for all $r > 0$, we can find $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ such that (5.8) holds.

Conversely, suppose $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ is such that (5.8) holds. Assume without loss of generality $r' \leq 1$. Then we have

$$|\tau(T' E_{|T'|}[0, \mu_r(T')])| \leq r h(r)$$

for all $r \in (0, r')$. Let $r'' > r'$ be such that $\mu_{r''}(T') = 0$. Let $d' = E_{|T'|}(0, \infty)$. Then

$$|\tau(T' E_{|T'|}[0, \mu_r(T')])| \leq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r \geq r'' \\ \mu_r(T') d' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Letting

$$h'(t) = \begin{cases} \max(h(t), \frac{\mu_{r'}(T') d'}{r'}) & \text{if } 0 < t < r' \\ \frac{\mu_{r'}(T') d'}{r'} & \text{if } r' \leq t < r'' \\ 0 & \text{if } r'' \leq t , \end{cases}$$

we have $h' \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ and

$$|\tau(T' E_{|T'|}[0, \mu_r(T')])| \leq r h'(r)$$

for all $r > 0$. Thus $T' \in [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$ by Lemma 5.1. □

Lemma 5.6. Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a nonzero submodule, let $T \in \mathcal{I}_b$ be normal and let $a \in \mathbf{C}$. If $a \neq 0$, let $P \in \mathcal{F}$ be a projection such that $\frac{|a|}{\tau(P)} > \|T\|$. If $a = 0$, let $P \in \mathcal{F}$ have nonzero trace. Then

$$T \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(P)}P \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$$

if and only if there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that

$$\forall s \in [1, \infty), \quad |a + \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty))| \leq s h(s) . \quad (5.9)$$

Remark 5.7. As will be apparent from the proof, for any $s' > 0$ the existence of $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that (5.9) holds is equivalent to the existence of $h' \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that

$$\forall s \in [s', \infty), \quad |a + \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty))| \leq s h'(s)$$

holds.

Proof Lemma 5.6. Suppose $a \neq 0$. Let $T' = T \oplus \frac{a}{\tau(P)}P$. Then for all $s > 0$, we have, (by Proposition 2.5), $\mu_{s+\tau(P)}(T') = \mu_s(T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{|T'|}(\mu_{s+\tau(P)}(T'), \infty) &= E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty) \oplus P, \\ \tau(T' E_{|T'|}(\mu_{s+\tau(P)}(T'), \infty)) &= a + \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

If $T' \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$, then it follows from (5.10) and Lemma 5.1 that there is $h' \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that

$$\forall s \in (0, \infty), \quad |a + \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty))| \leq (s + \tau(P))h'(s + \tau(P)).$$

Letting $h(s) = (1 + \tau(P))h'(s + \tau(P))$, we have $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ and that (5.9) holds.

On the other hand, still taking $a \neq 0$, suppose $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ and (5.9) holds. Using (5.10), we have

$$|\tau(T' E_{|T'|}(\mu_t(T'), \infty))| \leq (t - \tau(P))h(t - \tau(P))$$

for all $t \geq 1 + \tau(P)$. Using Proposition 2.2, we have

$$|\tau(T' E_{|T'|}(\mu_t(T'), \infty))| \leq \|T'\|t$$

for all $t > 0$. Therefore, letting

$$h'(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1+\tau(P)}h(t - \tau(P)) & \text{if } t \geq 1 + \tau(P) \\ \max(\frac{|a|}{\tau(P)}, \frac{h(1)}{1+\tau(P)}) & \text{if } 0 < t < 1 + \tau(P), \end{cases}$$

we get $h' \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ and

$$|\tau(T' E_{|T'|}(\mu_t(T'), \infty))| \leq t h'(t)$$

for all $t > 0$. Thus $T' \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ by Lemma 5.1.

When $a = 0$, the existence of $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ satifying (5.9) follows from $T \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ directly from Lemma 5.1, while proving that the existence of $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that (5.9) holds implies $T \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ is similar to the case $a \neq 0$, but easier. $\square$

Theorem 5.8. Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a nonzero submodule and let $T = T_{fs} + T_b \in \mathcal{I}$, where $T_{fs} \in \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ and $T_b \in \mathcal{I}_b$ are normal. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if there are $a \in \mathbf{C}$, $h_{fs} \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{fs})$ and $h_b \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that

$$\forall r \in (0, 1) \quad |a - \tau(T_{fs} E_{|T_{fs}|}[0, \mu_r(T_{fs})])| \leq r h_{fs}(r) \quad (5.11)$$

$$\forall s \in [1, \infty) \quad |a + \tau(T_b E_{|T_b|}(\mu_s(T_b), \infty))| \leq s h_b(s). \quad (5.12)$$

Proof. If $T_{fs} \neq 0$, then the conclusion of the theorem follows from Theorem 5.3 and Lemmas 5.4 and 5.6. If $T_{fs} = 0$, then we choose $a = 0$ and apply Lemma 5.1. $\square$

Let $\omega_{f_s}, \omega_b \in D^+(0, \infty)$ be given by

$$\omega_{f_s}(t) = \begin{cases} 1/t & \text{if } t < 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } t \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\omega_b(t) = \frac{1}{1+t}.$$

Corollary 5.9. *Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a nonzero submodule and let $T = T_{f_s} + T_b \in \mathcal{I}$, where $T_{f_s} \in \mathcal{I}_{f_s}$ and $T_b \in \mathcal{I}_b$ are normal.*

- (I) *Suppose $\omega_{f_s}, \omega_b \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $T_{f_s} \in [\mathcal{I}_{f_s}, \mathcal{M}]$ and $T_b \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$.*
- (II) *Suppose $\omega_{f_s} \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$ and $\omega_b \notin \mu(\mathcal{I})$. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $T_{f_s} \in [\mathcal{I}_{f_s}, \mathcal{M}]$ and there are $a \in \mathbf{C}$ and $h_b \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$ such that (5.12) holds.*
- (III) *Suppose $\omega_{f_s} \notin \mu(\mathcal{I})$ and $\omega_b \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $T_b \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ and there are $a \in \mathbf{C}$ and $h_{f_s} \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{f_s})$ such that (5.11) holds.*

Proof. If $\omega_b \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$, then for any $a \in \mathbf{C}$, the function

$$t \mapsto \begin{cases} |a|/t, & 0 < t < 1, \\ 0, & t \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

lies in $\mu(\mathcal{I}_{f_s})$, while if $\omega_{f_s} \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$, then for any $a \in \mathbf{C}$, the function

$$t \mapsto \begin{cases} |a|, & t \in (0, 1), \\ |a|/t, & t \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

lies in $\mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$. □

This seems like a convenient place to prove the following proposition, which will be needed in Section 6.

Proposition 5.10. *Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be a nonzero submodule and suppose $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Let*

$$\mathcal{I}_0 = \{T \in \mathcal{I} \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0\}.$$

Then $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] \cap \mathcal{I}_0 = [\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{M}]$.

Proof. Since $\supseteq$ is clear, we need only show $\subseteq$. Suppose $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] \cap \mathcal{I}_0$ and T is normal. It will suffice to show $T \in [\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{M}]$. Let $T = T_{f_s} + T_b$ where $T_{f_s} \in (\mathcal{I}_0)_{f_s} = \mathcal{I}_{f_s}$ and $T_b \in (\mathcal{I}_0)_b$ are normal. Note we have $(\mathcal{I}_0)_b = \mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{K}$, (see Remark 3.3). Since $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$, by Corollary 5.9, if $\omega_{f_s} \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$, then $T_{f_s} \in [\mathcal{I}_{f_s}, \mathcal{M}]$, while if $\omega_{f_s} \notin \mu(\mathcal{I})$, then there are $a \in \mathbf{C}$ and $h_{f_s} \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_{f_s})$ such that (5.11) holds. Since $\omega_b \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_0)$, by Corollary 5.9 in order to show $T \in [\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{M}]$ it will suffice to show $T_b \in [(\mathcal{I}_0)_b, \mathcal{M}]$. But $[\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{K} \ni T_b$. □

We will finish this section with a few observations relating $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ to $[\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ and $[\mathcal{I}_{f_s}, \mathcal{M}]$, and examples involving ideals of p -summable operators. Writing $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{f_s} +$

$\mathcal{I}_b$, we have $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$. Since $\mathcal{I}_{fs} \cap \mathcal{I}_b = \mathcal{F}$, and (see Corollary 5.2) $[\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{F} \cap \ker \tau$, we have

$$[\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \cap \mathcal{I}_b = [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \cap \mathcal{F} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F} & \text{if } \omega_{fs} \in \mu(\mathcal{I}) \\ \mathcal{F} \cap \ker \tau & \text{if } \omega_{fs} \notin \mu(\mathcal{I}), \end{cases}$$

$$[\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \cap \mathcal{I}_{fs} = [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] \cap \mathcal{F} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F} & \text{if } \omega_b \in \mu(\mathcal{I}) \\ \mathcal{F} \cap \ker \tau & \text{if } \omega_b \notin \mu(\mathcal{I}). \end{cases}$$

So we have the following result.

Proposition 5.11. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a nonzero submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$, for a II_∞ factor $\mathcal{M}$. Then*

- (i) $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ and $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_b$;
- (ii) $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}$ if and only if at least one of the following holds:
 - (a) $[\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ and $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_b$;
 - (b) $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ and $[\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_b$.

We now relate the commutator space $[\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ to its discrete analogue. Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be any type I_∞ factor (i.e. a copy of $B(\mathcal{H})$) such that the restriction of τ to $\mathcal{B}$ is semifinite. Let $\mathcal{I}_d = \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{B}$ and let $\mathcal{F}_d = \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{B}$; (the “d” is for “discrete”). Note that $\mathcal{I}_d$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{F}_d$ is the ideal of finite rank operators in $\mathcal{B}$. In the notation used in [7], the characteristic set $\mu(\mathcal{I}_d)$ of $\mathcal{I}_d$, consisting of the sequences of singular numbers of elements of $\mathcal{I}_d$, is naturally identified with the set of all functions $f \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$ that are constant on the intervals $[0, 1)$, $[1, 2)$, $[2, 3)$, $\dots$. The commutator space $[\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}]$ of an ideal of a I_∞ factor has been extensively studied — see [7] and references contained therein, and see [16] for some further results.

Lemma 5.12. *Let $T \in \mathcal{I}_b$ and assume $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$. Then there is $A \in \mathcal{I}_d$ such that $T - A \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$.*

Proof. We may without loss of generality assume $T = T^*$ and that $\tau(\tilde{Q}) = 1$ for a minimal projection $\tilde{Q}$ of $\mathcal{B}$. Let $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a family of projections in $\mathcal{M}$ obtained from Lemma 2.6. Let $Q_k = P_k - P_{k-1}$, ($k \in \mathbf{N}$), $\alpha_k = \tau(TQ_k)$ and $A' = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \alpha_k Q_k$. Then $TQ_k - \alpha_k Q_k$ is an element of the II_1 -factor $Q_k \mathcal{M} Q_k$ of trace zero and with

$$\|(T - \alpha_k)Q_k\| \leq \|TQ_k\| + |\alpha_k| \leq 2\|TQ_k\| \leq 2\mu_k(T).$$

Using [10, Thm. 2.3] as in the proof of Lemma 4.2, one shows $T - A' \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$. Let $\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2, \dots \in \mathcal{B}$ be pairwise orthogonal projections, each of trace 1, and let $U \in \mathcal{M}$ be a partial isometry such that $U^* Q_j U = \tilde{Q}_j$. Let $A = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \alpha_k \tilde{Q}_k$. Then $A = U^* A' U \in \mathcal{I}_d$ and $A' - A = [U, U^* A'] \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$. Thus $T - A \in [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$. $\square$

Proposition 5.13. (i) $\mathcal{B} \cap [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = [\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}]$.

(ii) $[\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_b$ if and only if $[\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}] = \mathcal{I}_d$.

(iii) $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_b$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_d + [\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}] = \mathcal{I}_d$.

Proof. We may without loss of generality assume $\tau(F) = 1$ for a minimal projection F of $\mathcal{B}$. The inclusion $\supseteq$ in (i) is clear. To show $\subseteq$, it will suffice to show that $T = T^* \in \mathcal{B} \cap [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}]$ implies $T \in [\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}]$. By Lemma 5.1, there is $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I}_b)$

satisfying (5.4). Since h is bounded, replacing h if necessary by a slightly greater function, we may without loss of generality assume h is constant on all intervals $[0, 1), [1, 2), \dots$. We may write $T = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i F_i$ for a sequence of pairwise orthogonal, minimal projections F_i of $\mathcal{B}$ and for $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{R}$ with $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots$. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n| > 0$, then $\mathcal{I}_b = \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{I}_d = \mathcal{B}$, so (i) holds. Hence we may without loss of generality assume $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n| = 0$. Suppose k and n are nonnegative integers with $k < n$,

$$|\lambda_{k+1}| = |\lambda_{k+2}| = \dots = |\lambda_n| > |\lambda_{n+1}|$$

and either $k = 0$ or $|\lambda_k| > |\lambda_{k+1}|$. If $s \in [k, n)$, then $\mu_s(T) = |\lambda_{k+1}|$, so by (5.4),

$$|\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k| = |\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \infty))| \leq sh(s).$$

Thus, if $\ell \in \{k, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\ell \neq 0$, then

$$|\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell| \leq |\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k| + (\ell - k)|\lambda_\ell| \leq \ell h(\ell) + \ell |\lambda_\ell|$$

and

$$\frac{|\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell|}{\ell} \leq h(\ell) + |\lambda_\ell|.$$

From this, the main result of [7] implies $T \in [\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}]$, and (i) is proved.

From (i), we have

$$[\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_b \implies [\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}] = \mathcal{I}_d.$$

The reverse implication follows from Lemma 5.12. Hence (ii) is proved.

To prove (iii), we have $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_d + (\mathcal{F} \cap \ker \tau) = \mathcal{F}_d + [\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{M}]$, so

$$\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{F}_d + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}].$$

From (i) we thus obtain

$$\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_b \implies \mathcal{F}_d + [\mathcal{I}_d, \mathcal{B}] = \mathcal{I}_d.$$

The reverse implication follows from Lemma 5.12. $\square$

We now point out results relating $[\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$ and commutator spaces of submodules of II_1 -factors. Let $P \in \mathcal{M}$ be a projection with $\tau(P) = 1$ and consider the II_1 -factor $\mathcal{M}_1 = P\mathcal{M}P$. Then $P\overline{\mathcal{M}}P$ is equal to the module $\overline{\mathcal{M}_1}$ of τ -measureable operators affiliated to $\mathcal{M}_1$. Given a nonzero submodule $\mathcal{I}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$, consider the submodule $\mathcal{I}_1 = P\mathcal{I}P$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}_1}$. Then the following result follows directly from the characterizations of commutator spaces found in Theorem 4.6 and Lemma 5.1.

Proposition 5.14. (i) $\overline{\mathcal{M}_1} \cap [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = [\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{M}_1]$.
(ii) $[\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ if and only if $[\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{M}_1] = \mathcal{I}_1$.
(iii) $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}_{fs}$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}_1 + [\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{M}_1] = \mathcal{I}_1$.

For $0 < p < \infty$, let $\mathcal{L}_p$ denote the submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ whose characterisic set $\mu(\mathcal{L}_p)$ consists of all the p -integrable functions in $D^+(0, \infty)$. Thus

$$\mathcal{L}_p = \{T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}} \mid \tau((T^*T)^{p/2}) < \infty\},$$

where we have extended τ in the usual way to be a map from positive elements of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ to $[0, +\infty]$. Also, let $\mathcal{L}_\infty = \mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 5.15. *If $0 < p < 1$, then*

$$[(\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = (\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs} \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$[(\mathcal{L}_p)_b, \mathcal{M}] = (\mathcal{L}_p)_b \cap \ker \tau, \quad (5.14)$$

so $\mathcal{F} + [(\mathcal{L}_p)_b, \mathcal{M}] = (\mathcal{L}_p)_b$.

With $p = 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{F} + [(\mathcal{L}_1)_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \neq (\mathcal{L}_1)_{fs} \quad (5.15)$$

and

$$\mathcal{F} + [(\mathcal{L}_1)_b, \mathcal{M}] \neq (\mathcal{L}_1)_b. \quad (5.16)$$

If $1 < p \leq \infty$, then

$$[(\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = (\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs} \cap \ker \tau, \quad (5.17)$$

so $\mathcal{F} + [(\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] = (\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs}$, and

$$[(\mathcal{L}_p)_b, \mathcal{M}] = (\mathcal{L}_p)_b. \quad (5.18)$$

Proof. When $p = \infty$, we have $(\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs} = \mathcal{F}$ and $(\mathcal{L}_p)_b = \mathcal{M}$, and these special cases of (5.17) and (5.18) have been considered previously. For $p < \infty$, all of the relations (5.13)–(5.18) can be readily verified from properties of L^p -functions.

Moreover, (5.14), (5.16) and (5.18) follow from Proposition 5.13 and the corresponding discrete analogues, which follow readily from the main result of [7] and were originally proved in [1], [25] and [22], respectively. On the other hand, (5.13) and (5.17) follow from Proposition 5.14 and [12, Prop. 2.12].

As an example, let us verify (5.15) directly. Clearly $[(\mathcal{L}_1)_{fs}, \mathcal{M}] \subseteq \ker \tau$, so it will suffice to find $T = T^* \in (\mathcal{L}_1)_{fs} \cap \ker \tau$ with $T \notin [(\mathcal{L}_1)_{fs}, \mathcal{M}]$. Using Lemma 5.1, it will suffice to find $f \in L^1[0, 1]$ such that $\int_0^1 f = 0$ but the function

$$s \mapsto \frac{1}{s} \int_s^1 f(t) dt, \quad 0 < s < 1$$

is not integrable. Such a function is given by

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t(\log t)^2} & \text{if } 0 < t < 1/2 \\ \frac{-2}{\log 2} & \text{if } 1/2 \leq t < 1. \end{cases}$$

□

Propositions 5.15 and 5.11 now yield the following examples.

Examples 5.16. Let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{L}_p)_{fs} + (\mathcal{L}_q)_b$, for some $0 < p, q \leq \infty$.

- (i) If $p < 1$ and $q \neq 1$ or if $p \neq 1$ and $q > 1$, then $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}$.
- (ii) If $p > 1$ and $q < 1$, then $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I} \cap \ker \tau$ and $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] = \mathcal{I}$.
- (iii) If $p = 1$ or $q = 1$, then $\mathcal{F} + [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}] \neq \mathcal{I}$.

6. SPECTRAL CHARACTERIZATION OF $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$.

In this section, $\mathcal{M}$ will be a II_∞ -factor with fixed normal, semifinite trace τ .

Let $\mathcal{L}_{\log}$ be the submodule of all $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \log(1 + \mu_s(T)) ds < \infty.$$

As is usual, let $\mathcal{L}_p$ be the submodule of all $T \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty \mu_s(T)^p ds < \infty.$$

If $\mathcal{I}$ is a submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ we say that $\mathcal{I}$ is *geometrically stable* if $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{L}_{\log}$ and if whenever $h \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$ then $g \in \mu(\mathcal{I})$, where

$$g(t) = \exp \left(t^{-1} \int_0^t \log h(s) ds \right) \quad t > 0.$$

Geometric stability is a relatively mild condition. For example let $\mathcal{X}$ be a rearrangement-invariant quasi-Banach function space on $(0, \infty)$ and suppose $\mathcal{I} = \{T : (\mu_s(T))_{s>0} \in \mathcal{X}\} \subseteq \mathcal{K} + \mathcal{L}_{\log}$, where $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is the ideal of τ -compact operators (see Remark 3.3); then $\mathcal{I}$ is geometrically stable by Proposition 3.2 of [12]. A non-geometrically stable ideal in $B(\mathcal{H})$ is constructed in [8], and from this a non-geometrically stable ideal of $\mathcal{M}$ can be constructed.

Suppose $T \in \mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$. Then the Fuglede-Kadison determinant [13] of $I + T$ is defined by

$$\Delta(I + T) = \exp(\tau(\log |I + T|)).$$

Using [2] Remark 3.4 we note that $T \mapsto \log \Delta(I + T)$ is plurisubharmonic on $\mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$. In the Appendix of [2] the definition of $\Delta(I + T)$ is extended to $\mathcal{L}_{\log}$ and it is shown that $T \mapsto \Delta(I + T)$ is upper-semicontinuous for the natural topology of $\mathcal{L}_{\log}$. It is not shown explicitly that $T \mapsto \log \Delta(I + T)$ is plurisubharmonic on $\mathcal{L}_{\log}$ but this follows trivially from the results of [2]:

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose $S, T \in \mathcal{L}_{\log}$. Then*

$$\log \Delta(I + S) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log \Delta(I + S + e^{i\theta} T) d\theta.$$

Proof. Let $S = H + iK$ and $T = H' + iK'$ be the splitting of S, T into real and imaginary parts. Let $R = |H| + |H'| + |K| + |K'|$. Then $R \in \mathcal{L}_{\log}$ and $(I + S + zT)(I + R)^{-1} \in I + \mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$ for all z . Using the fact that $T \mapsto \log \Delta(I + T)$ is plurisubharmonic on $\mathcal{L}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}$ and

$$\Delta((I + S + zT)(I + R)^{-1}) = \Delta(I + S + zT)(\Delta(I + R))^{-1},$$

it is easy to deduce the Lemma. □

Let $g_0(w) = (1 - w)$ and

$$g_k(w) = (1 - w) \exp(w + \cdots + \frac{w^k}{k})$$

for $k \geq 1$. If $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\log}$ let $k = 0$; if $T \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{L}_p$ for some $p > 0$, let k be an integer such that $k + 1 \geq p$. Then, following [2], there is a unique σ -finite measure $\nu = \nu_T$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\log \Delta(g_k(wT)) = \int \log |g_k(wz)| d\nu_T(z) \quad w \in \mathbb{C}.$$

ν_T is called the *Brown measure* of T , and is independent of the choice of k when many choices are permissible. If $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\log} \cup \bigcup_{p>0} (\mathcal{L}_p \cap \mathcal{M})$ we shall say that T *admits a Brown measure*. The measure ν_T satisfies the following estimates. If $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\log}$ and $k = 0$ then

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} \log(1 + |z|) d\nu_T(z) < \infty \quad (6.1)$$

while if $T \in \mathcal{L}_p \cap \mathcal{M}$ and $k + 1 \geq p$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} |z|^p d\nu_T(z) < \infty. \quad (6.2)$$

We refer to [2, Theorem 3.6] and the remark on p.29 of [2].

Of course if T is *normal* there is a projection-valued spectral measure $B \rightarrow E_T(B)$ defined for Borel subsets B of the complex plane and we can define a spectral measure ν_T by

$$\nu_T(B) = \tau(E_T(B)).$$

If T also admits a Brown measure then ν_T coincides with the Brown measure.

If T either admits a Brown measure or is normal and satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$, then for every $0 < r < s < \infty$ we define

$$\Phi(r, s; T) = \int_{r < |z| \leq s} z d\nu_T(z). \quad (6.3)$$

If T is normal then we can rewrite (6.3) in the form

$$\Phi(r, s; T) = \tau(T E_{|T|}(r, s]). \quad (6.4)$$

Note that it is elementary that if $|\alpha| = 1$ then $\Phi(r, s; \alpha T) = \alpha \Phi(r, s; T)$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $0 < r < s < \infty$.*

- (1) *Suppose $T_1, \dots, T_N$ are normal with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T_j) = 0$ and $T_1 + \dots + T_N = 0$. Then*

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^N \Phi(r, s; T_j) \right| \leq 2N \sum_{j=1}^N (r\tau(E_{|T_j|}(r, \infty)) + s\tau(E_{|T_j|}(s, \infty))). \quad (6.5)$$

- (2) *Suppose $|\alpha| \leq 1$ and T is normal with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$. Then*

$$|\Phi(r, s; \alpha T) - \alpha \Phi(r, s; T)| \leq |\tau(rE_{|T|}(r, \infty) + sE_{|T|}(s, \infty))|. \quad (6.6)$$

- (3) *If T is normal with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$, then*

$$|\Phi(r, s; \operatorname{Re} T) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T)| \leq \tau(rE_{|T|}(r, \infty) + sE_{|T|}(s, \infty)) \quad (6.7)$$

and

$$|\Phi(r, s; \operatorname{Im} T) - \operatorname{Im} \Phi(r, s; T)| \leq \tau(rE_{|T|}(r, \infty) + sE_{|T|}(s, \infty)) \quad (6.8)$$

Proof. (1) Pick a projection $P \geq E_{|T_j|}(s, \infty)$ for $1 \leq j \leq N$ and such that $\tau(P) \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \tau(E_{|T_j|}(s, \infty))$. Then choose $Q \geq P$ with $Q \geq E_{|T_j|}(r, \infty)$ for $1 \leq j \leq N$ and

$$\tau(Q) \leq \sum_{j=1}^N (\tau(E_{|T_j|}(r, \infty)) + \tau(E_{|T_j|}(s, \infty))) \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^N \tau(E_{|T_j|}(r, \infty)).$$

Then

$$\|(Q - E_{|T_j|}(r, \infty))T_j\| \leq r, \quad \|(P - E_{|T_j|}(s, \infty))T_j\| \leq s, \quad 1 \leq j \leq N.$$

Hence

$$|\tau((Q - E_{|T_j|}(r, \infty))T_j)| \leq r\tau(Q)$$

and

$$|\tau((P - E_{|T_j|}(s, \infty))T_j)| \leq s\tau(P).$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \Phi(r, s; T_j) \right| &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \tau(T_j(Q - E_{|T_j|}(s, \infty)) - T_j(P - E_{|T_j|}(r, \infty))) \right| \\ &\leq N(r\tau(Q) + s\tau(P)). \end{aligned}$$

Now (6.5) follows.

For (2), we note that

$$|\Phi(r, s; \alpha T) - \alpha \Phi(r, s; T)| \leq |\alpha| \left(\int_{r < |z| \leq |\alpha|^{-1}r} |z| d\nu_T(z) + \int_{s < |z| \leq |\alpha|^{-1}s} |z| d\nu_T(z) \right).$$

Then (6.6) follows immediately.

Part (3) is similar to (2). For example we observe for (6.7) that

$$|\Phi(r, s; \operatorname{Re} T) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T)| \leq \int_{|\operatorname{Re} z| \leq r < |z|} |\operatorname{Re} z| d\nu_T(z) + \int_{|\operatorname{Re} z| \leq s < |z|} |\operatorname{Re} z| d\nu_T(z).$$

□

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Suppose $T \in \mathcal{I}$ is normal and satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if there exists a positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}$ such that*

$$|\Phi(r, s; T)| \leq r\tau(E_V(r, \infty)) + s\tau(E_V(s, \infty)) \quad 0 < r < s < \infty. \quad (6.9)$$

Proof. Assume that (6.9) holds. By replacing V with $V + |T|$, if necessary, we may without loss of generality assume $V \geq |T|$. Let $h(t) = \mu_t(V)$. Then $h(t) \geq \mu_t(T)$. If $0 < t < s < \infty$, then from (2.2) we have

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}(h(s), h(t)))| \leq sh(s) + th(t).$$

Now using (2.2) again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_t(T))) - \tau(T E_{|T|}(h(s), h(t))) \right| \leq \\ & \leq \int_{\mu_s(T) < |z| \leq h(s)} |z| d\nu_T(z) + \int_{\mu_t(T) < |z| \leq h(t)} |z| d\nu_T(z) \\ & \leq sh(s) + th(t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\left| \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_t(T))) \right| \leq 2sh(s) + 2th(t)$$

and we can apply Theorem 4.7 and (4.17) to conclude that $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$.

Conversely, suppose T satisfies (4.17) for some h . Replacing h with

$$\tilde{h}(t) = \frac{2}{t} \int_{t/2}^t h(s) ds,$$

if necessary, we may without loss of generality assume h is continuous. Let $V \in \mathcal{I}$ be a positive operator such that $\mu_t(V) = h(t)$. Given $0 < r < s < \infty$, choose $0 < v < u$ so that $h(2u) \leq r < h(u)$ and $h(2v) \leq s < h(v)$. Then

$$\left| \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_{2u}(T), \mu_{2v}(T))) \right| \leq 2ur + 2vs.$$

Now arguing as above,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \tau(T E_{|T|}(\mu_{2u}(T), \mu_{2v}(T))) - \tau(T E_{|T|}(r, s)) \right| \leq \\ & \leq \int_{\mu_{2u}(T) < |z| \leq r} |z| d\nu_T(z) + \int_{\mu_{2v}(T) < |z| \leq s} |z| d\nu_T(z) \\ & \leq 2ur + 2vs. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.3, we have $\tau(E_V(r, \infty)) \geq u$ and $\tau(E_V(s, \infty)) \geq v$. Combining gives

$$\left| \tau(T E_{|T|}(r, s)) \right| \leq 4ur + 4vs \leq 4r\tau(E_V(r, \infty)) + 4s\tau(E_V(s, \infty)).$$

Replacing V by $V \oplus V \oplus V \oplus V$, (cf Definition 2.4) we have (6.9). $\square$

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\psi : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a subharmonic function such that ψ vanishes in a neighborhood of 0, is harmonic outside some compact set, and for a suitable constant C , satisfies the estimate $|\psi(z)| \leq C \log(1+|z|)$ for all z . If T admits a Brown measure, then define*

$$\Psi(T) = \int_{\mathbf{C}} \psi(z) d\nu_T(z).$$

Suppose $S, T \in \mathcal{L}_{\log}$ or if $S, T \in \mathcal{L}_p \cap \mathcal{M}$ for some $p > 0$. Then $\Psi(S + e^{i\theta}T)$ is a Borel function of θ and

$$\Psi(S) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Psi(S + e^{i\theta}T) d\theta. \quad (6.10)$$

Proof. By an easy approximation argument it will suffice to consider the case when ψ is C^2 . In this case for any choice of $k \geq 0$ we have the formula ([2] Proposition 2.2)

$$\psi(z) = \int_{\mathbf{C}} \log |g_k(w^{-1}z)| |\nabla^2 \psi(w)| d\lambda(w) \quad z \in \mathbf{C}$$

where λ denotes area measure. Hence if T admits a Brown measure and k is suitably chosen,

$$\Psi(T) = \int_{\mathbf{C}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{C}} \log |g_k(w^{-1}z)| |\nabla^2 \psi(w)| d\lambda(w) \right) d\nu_T(z). \quad (6.11)$$

Now it can be checked that the function $|\log g_k(w^{-1}z)| |\nabla^2 \psi(w)|$ is integrable for the product measure $\lambda \times \nu_T$. Indeed, let us first consider the case when $T \in \mathcal{L}_p \cap \mathcal{M}$, with $k+1 \geq p$. Estimates on the growth of $\log |g_k(w)|$ (cf. p. 11 of [2]) give

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |\log |g_k(r^{-1}e^{-i\theta}z)|| d\theta \leq C \min(|z|^{k+1}|r|^{-k-1}, |z|^{k+\epsilon}|r|^{-k-\epsilon})$$

for suitable C and $\epsilon > 0$. Since $\nabla^2 \psi$ has compact support contained in some annulus away from the origin we need only observe that

$$\int \min(|z|^{k+1}, |z|^{k+\epsilon}) d\nu_T(z) < \infty$$

which follows from (6.2). On the other hand, if $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\log}$ and thus $k = 0$, we use the estimate

$$\int_0^{2\pi} |\log |g_k(r^{-1}e^{-i\theta}z)|| d\theta \leq C \log(1 + |z|)$$

and (6.1). It follows we can use Fubini's theorem to rewrite (6.11) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(T) &= \int_{\mathbf{C}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{C}} \log |g_k(w^{-1}z)| d\nu_T(z) \right) \nabla^2 \psi(w) d\lambda(w) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{C}} \log \Delta(g_k(w^{-1}T)) \nabla^2 \psi(w) d\lambda(w). \end{aligned}$$

Now the result follows easily from the upper semicontinuity of $\log \Delta$ and Lemma 6.1. $\square$

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a geometrically stable submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. If $T \in \mathcal{I}$ admits a Brown measure, then there is a normal operator $S \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\nu_S = \nu_T$. Furthermore, S admits a Brown measure.*

Proof. It will suffice to show the existence of a positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}$ so that

$$\nu_T(|z| > r) \leq \nu_V(r, \infty) \quad 0 < r < \infty.$$

Let $H = \operatorname{Re} T$, $K = \operatorname{Im} T$ and then set $P = |H| + |K|$. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is geometrically stable there exists a positive $V \in \mathcal{I}$ with

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \log \mu_s(P) ds \leq \log \mu_t(V) \quad 0 < t < \infty.$$

Therefore, $\mu_t(P) \leq \mu_t(V)$ and $\nu_P(r, \infty) \leq \nu_V(r, \infty)$ for all $0 < r < \infty$.

Suppose for contradiction that for some $0 < r < \infty$ we have $t = \nu_T(|z| > r) > \nu_V(r, \infty)$. Choose $r_0 < r$ so that $\nu_P[r_0, \infty) \geq t \geq \nu_P(r_0, \infty)$. Let $\psi(z) = \log_+ \frac{|z|}{r_0}$ and define Ψ as in Lemma 6.4. Then

$$\Psi(T) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Psi(T + e^{i\theta} T^*) d\theta.$$

Now $T + e^{i\theta}T^* = 2e^{i\theta/2}(H \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + K \sin \frac{\theta}{2})$. Hence $|T + e^{i\theta}T^*| \leq 2(|H| + |K|) = P$ and it follows that $\Psi(T + e^{i\theta}T^*) \leq \Psi(P)$ for $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$.

$$t \log \frac{r}{r_0} \leq \int \log_+ \frac{|z|}{r_0} d\nu_T(z) = \Psi(T) \leq \Psi(P) = \int_0^t \log_+ \frac{\mu_s(P)}{r_0} ds \leq t \log \frac{\mu_t(V)}{r_0}.$$

Thus $\mu_t(V) \geq r$ and hence $\nu_V(r, \infty) \geq t$ contrary to assumption.

The inequalities (6.1) and (6.2) imply that S admits a Brown measure. $\square$

Before proving our main result it will be convenient to introduce some notation. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be any submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ not containing $\mathcal{M}$. Hence $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(T) = 0$ for every $T \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $F(r, s)$ be a function of two variables defined for $0 < r < s < \infty$. We write $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$ if there exists a positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$|F(r, s)| \leq r\tau(E_V(r, \infty)) + s\tau(E_V(s, \infty)) \quad 0 < r < s < \infty.$$

We write $F \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$ if there is a positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$|F(r, s)| \leq \int_{(0, \infty)} \left(r \log_+ \frac{x}{r} + s \log_+ \frac{x}{s} \right) d\nu_V(x) \quad 0 < r < s < \infty.$$

Both $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$ and $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$ are easily seen to be vector spaces. Also note that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I}) \subset \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$ (replace V by eV .) Proposition 6.3 states that if T is normal then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $\Phi(r, s; T) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$. We improve this for geometrically stable submodules.

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose $\mathcal{I}$ is a geometrically stable submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\mathcal{M} \not\subset \mathcal{I}$. If $T \in \mathcal{I}$ is normal, then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $\Phi(r, s; T) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$.*

Proof. One direction is trivial from Proposition 6.3. For the other direction suppose $\Phi(r, s; T) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$. Choose V a positive operator in $\mathcal{I}$ so that

$$|\Phi(r, s; T)| \leq \int_{(0, \infty)} \left(r \log_+ \frac{x}{r} + s \log_+ \frac{x}{s} \right) d\nu_V(x) \quad 0 < r < s < \infty. \quad (6.12)$$

We can assume $V \geq |T|$. Let $h(t) = \mu_t(V)$ and let

$$g(t) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \log h(s) ds\right) \quad 0 < t < \infty.$$

Suppose $0 < t < s < \infty$. Then similarly to in the proof of Proposition 6.3, we get

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_t(T)))| \leq |\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(V), \mu_t(V)))| + sh(s) + th(t).$$

Now from (6.12) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(V), \mu_t(V)))| &\leq \int_{(0, \infty)} \left(\mu_s(V) \log_+ \frac{x}{\mu_s(V)} + \mu_t(V) \log_+ \frac{x}{\mu_t(V)} \right) d\nu_V(x) \\ &= \int_0^s h(s) \log \frac{h(u)}{h(s)} du + \int_0^t h(t) \log \frac{h(u)}{h(t)} du \\ &= sh(s) \log \frac{g(s)}{h(s)} + th(t) \log \frac{g(t)}{h(t)} \\ &\leq sg(s) + tg(t). \end{aligned}$$

Combining, we see that

$$|\tau(TE_{|T|}(\mu_s(T), \mu_t(T)))| \leq s(h(s) + g(s)) + t(h(t) + g(t))$$

and so by Theorem 4.7, $T \in [I, \mathcal{M}]$. $\square$

Theorem 6.7. *Suppose $\mathcal{I}$ is a submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\mathcal{M} \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and $T \in \mathcal{I}$ admits a Brown measure. Then*

$$\operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T) - \Phi(r, s; \operatorname{Re} T) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I}), \quad \operatorname{Im} \Phi(r, s; T) - \Phi(r, s; \operatorname{Im} T) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I}).$$

Proof. Let $H = \operatorname{Re} T$ and $K = \operatorname{Im} T$. We need only prove the statement concerning the real part, since the other half follows by considering iT . We also note that if $s \leq 2r$ we have $|\Phi(r, s, T)| \leq 2r\nu_T(|z| > r)$ and $|\Phi(r, s; H)| \leq 2r\nu_{|H|}(r, \infty)$. By Proposition 6.5, this implies an estimate

$$|\operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T) - \Phi(r, s; H)| \leq 2r\nu_V(r, \infty) \quad 0 < r < s \leq 2r < \infty$$

for a suitable positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}$. This means we need only consider estimates when $s > 2r$.

We first fix a smooth bump function $b : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\operatorname{supp} b \subset (0, 1/2)$, $b \geq 0$, $\int b(x)dx = 1$. Let $\beta(t) = 2|b(t)| + |b'(t)|$.

Now suppose $0 < r < s < \infty$, with $s > 2r$. We define

$$\varphi_{r,s}(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} b(t - \log r) - b(t - \log s) dt.$$

Notice that the two terms in the integrand are never simultaneously positive (since $\log 2 > \frac{1}{2}$), and $\varphi_{r,s}$ is a bump function which satisfies $\varphi_{r,s}(\tau) = 0$ if $\tau < \log r$ or $\tau > \frac{1}{2} + \log s$, while $\varphi_{r,s}(\tau) = 1$ if $\frac{1}{2} + \log r \leq \tau \leq \log s$ and $0 \leq \varphi_{r,s}(\tau) \leq 1$ for all τ .

Then let $\rho_{r,s}$ be defined to be the function such that $\rho_{r,s}(\tau) = 0$ if $\tau < \log r$ and

$$\rho_{r,s}''(\tau) = e^{\tau}(2|\varphi_{r,s}'(\tau)| + |\varphi_{r,s}''(\tau)|).$$

In fact, this implies that

$$\rho_{r,s}''(\tau) = e^{\tau}(\beta(\tau - \log r) + \beta(\tau - \log s))$$

and then

$$\rho_{r,s}'(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^t(\beta(t - \log r) + \beta(t - \log s)) dt$$

and

$$\rho_{r,s}(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} (\tau - t)e^t(\beta(t - \log r) + \beta(t - \log s)) dt.$$

Thus, if we set

$$C_0 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^t \beta(t) dt,$$

then

$$\rho_{r,s}'(\tau) \leq C_0(r\chi_{(\tau > \log r)} + s\chi_{(\tau > \log s)})$$

and so

$$0 \leq \rho_{r,s}(\tau) \leq C_0(r(\tau - \log r)_+ + s(\tau - \log s)_+). \quad (6.13)$$

Now we use the argument of Lemma 2.6 of [18]. We define

$$\psi_{r,s}(z) = \rho_{r,s}(\log |z|) - x\varphi_{r,s}(\log |z|) \quad z = x + iy \neq 0$$

and $\psi(0) = 0$. Then if $z \neq 0$,

$$\nabla^2 \rho_{r,s}(\log |z|) = |z|^{-2} \rho_{r,s}''(\log |z|).$$

Similarly

$$\nabla^2(x\varphi_{r,s}(\log |z|)) = \frac{x}{|z|^2}(2\varphi_{r,s}'(\log |z|) + \varphi_{r,s}''(\log |z|)).$$

Thus by construction, $|\nabla^2(x\varphi_{r,s}(\log |z|))| \leq \nabla^2(\rho_{r,s}(\log |z|))$ and so $\psi_{r,s}$ is subharmonic. Note that $\psi_{r,s}$ also vanishes on a neighborhood of 0 and is harmonic outside a compact set. We note the estimates (from (6.13))

$$0 \leq \rho_{r,s}(\log |z|) \leq C_0 \left(r \log_+ \frac{|z|}{r} + s \log_+ \frac{|z|}{s} \right) \quad (6.14)$$

and

$$0 \leq \psi_{r,s}(z) \leq C_0 \left(r \log_+ \frac{|z|}{r} + s \log_+ \frac{|z|}{s} \right) \quad |z| \geq 2s. \quad (6.15)$$

Note of course that C_0 is independent of r, s .

If A admits a Brown measure or is normal with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(A) = 0$, let us define

$$\tilde{\Phi}(r, s; A) = \int_{\mathbf{C}} (\operatorname{Re} z) \varphi_{r,s}(\log |z|) d\nu_A(z)$$

$$\Omega(r, s; A) = \int_{\mathbf{C}} \rho_{r,s}(\log |z|) d\nu_A(z)$$

$$\Psi(r, s; A) = \int_{\mathbf{C}} \psi_{r,s}(z) d\nu_A(z).$$

Thus $\Psi(r, s; A) = \Omega(r, s; A) - \tilde{\Phi}(r, s; A)$ and $\Psi(r, s; -A) = \Omega(r, s; A) + \tilde{\Phi}(r, s; A)$. We can apply Lemma 6.4 to $\Psi(r, s; \cdot)$, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(r, s; T) &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Psi(r, s; T + e^{i\theta} T^*) d\theta \\ \Psi(r, s; -T) &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Psi(r, s; -T - e^{i\theta} T^*) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\theta \rightarrow \tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T + e^{i\theta} T^*)$ is a Borel function by using Lemma 6.4 and the equation

$$\tilde{\Phi}(r, s; A) = \frac{1}{2}(\Psi(r, s; A) - \Psi(r, s; -A)).$$

We have

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T + e^{i\theta} T^*) d\theta - \tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Omega(r, s; T + e^{i\theta} T^*) d\theta. \quad (6.16)$$

We first estimate the right-hand side of (6.16). Note that $\Omega(r, s; T + e^{i\theta}T^*) = \Omega(r, s; W_\theta)$ where $W_\theta = 2(H \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + K \sin \frac{\theta}{2})$ is hermitian and hence from (6.14),

$$\Omega(r, s, W_\theta) \leq C_0 \left(r \int_0^\infty \log_+ \frac{\mu_t(|W_\theta|)}{r} dt + s \int_0^\infty \log_+ \frac{\mu_t(|W_\theta|)}{s} dt \right).$$

Hence for all $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$,

$$\Omega(r, s, W_\theta) \leq C_0 \left(r \int_0^\infty \log_+ \frac{\mu_t(P)}{r} dt + s \int_0^\infty \log_+ \frac{\mu_t(P)}{s} dt \right),$$

where $P = 2(|H| + |K|)$. Thus the right-hand side of (6.16) is estimated by

$$C_0 \left(r \int_0^\infty \log_+ \frac{\mu_t(P)}{r} dt + s \int_0^\infty \log_+ \frac{\mu_t(P)}{s} dt \right).$$

In other words the right-hand side of (6.16) belongs to $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$, and hence so does the left-hand side.

Now we turn to the left-hand side of (6.16). We note that

$$|\tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T)| \leq \int_{r < |z| < 2r} |z| d\nu_T(z) + \int_{s < |z| < 2s} |z| d\nu_T(z).$$

Hence

$$|\tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T)| \leq 2r\nu_T(|z| > r) + 2s\nu_T(|z| > s).$$

By Proposition 6.5 this implies that $\tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$.

By the same argument we also have

$$\sup_{0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi} |\tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T + e^{i\theta}T^*) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T + e^{i\theta}T^*)| \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I}).$$

Now, by using parts (1) and (3) of Proposition 6.2, we easily obtain that

$$\sup_{0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi} |\operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T + e^{i\theta}T^*) - (1 + \cos \theta)\Phi(r, s; H) + \sin \theta \Phi(r, s; K)| \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I}).$$

So on integration we find that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{\Phi}(r, s; T + e^{i\theta}T^*) d\theta - \Phi(r, s; H) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I}).$$

It follows that the left-hand side of (6.16) differs from $|\operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T) - \Phi(r, s; H)|$ by a function in class $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$. Combining we obtain:

$$\operatorname{Re} \Phi(r, s; T) - \Phi(r, s; H) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I}).$$

□

Theorem 6.8. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a geometrically stable submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Let $T \in \mathcal{I}$ admit a Brown measure. Then $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if there is a positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}$ with*

$$\left| \int_{r < |z| \leq s} z d\nu_T(z) \right| \leq r\tau(E_V(r, \infty)) + s\tau(E_V(s, \infty)) \quad 0 < r, s < \infty. \quad (6.17)$$

Proof. First suppose $\mathcal{M} \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Let $H = \frac{1}{2}(T + T^*)$ and $K = \frac{1}{2i}(T - T^*)$. Note that $T \in [I, M]$ if and only if $H, K \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$. Then by Theorem 6.7 we have $\Phi(r, s; T) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$ if and only if $\Phi(r, s; H), \Phi(r, s; K) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$. By Proposition 6.6 this implies that $\Phi(r, s; T) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$ if and only if $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$.

Let $S \in \mathcal{I}$ be a normal operator with $\nu_S = \nu_T$ as given by Proposition 6.5. Then the same reasoning as above applies to S , yielding $S \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $\Phi(r, s; S) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{I})$. By Proposition 6.3, $S \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $\Phi(r, s; S) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$. But $\Phi(r, s; T) = \Phi(r, s; S)$, so $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$ if and only if $\Phi(r, s; T) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$.

Now suppose $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. If $T \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$, then by Proposition 5.10, $T \in [\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{M}]$, so by the case just proved there is a positive operator $V \in \mathcal{I}_0$ making (6.17) hold. On the other hand, suppose $V \in \mathcal{I}$ is a positive operator making (6.17) hold. Let $S \in \mathcal{I}$ be a normal operator with $\nu_S = \nu_T$ as given by Proposition 6.5. Then

$$|\Phi(r, s; S)| = |\Phi(r, s; T)| \leq r\tau(E_V(r, \infty)) + s\tau(E_V(s, \infty)) \quad 0 < r, s < \infty.$$

Hence, by Proposition 6.3, $S \in [\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$. Invoking Propositions 5.10 and 6.3 again, we find a positive operator $V' \in \mathcal{I}_0$ such that

$$|\Phi(r, s; S)| \leq r\tau(E_{V'}(r, \infty)) + s\tau(E_{V'}(s, \infty)) \quad 0 < r, s < \infty.$$

But then, since $\mathcal{M} \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}_0$, we get $T \in [\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{M}]$ by the case proved above. $\square$

Let us say that T is *approximately nilpotent* if T admits a Brown measure with $\nu_T = 0$. This is equivalent to the statement that $\Delta(g_k(wT)) = 1$ for all $w \in \mathbb{C}$.

Corollary 6.9. *If $\mathcal{I}$ is a geometrically stable submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ then every approximately nilpotent $T \in \mathcal{I}$ belongs to $[\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{M}]$.*

We remark that in the case of an ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of $B(\mathcal{H})$ the relationship between the subspace $[\mathcal{I}, B(\mathcal{H})]$ and the growth of the characteristic determinant is discussed further in [19], and it is possible that some analogous results can be obtained here for the Fuglede–Kadison determinant.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.H. Anderson, *Commutators in ideals of trace class operators II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **35** (1986), 373-378.
- [2] L.G. Brown, *Lidskii's theorem in the type II case*, in *Proc. U.S.-Japan Seminar, Kyoto 1983*, Pitman Research Notes Math. Ser. 123 (1986) pp. 1-35.
- [3] J.W. Calkin, *Two-sided ideals and congruences in the ring of bounded operators in Hilbert space*, Ann. of Math. **42** (1941), 839-873.
- [4] C. Cecchini, *On two definitions of measurable and locally measurable operators*, Bullettino U. M. I. (5) **15-A** (1978), 526-534.
- [5] P.G. Dodds, T.K. Dodds and B. de Pagter, *Noncommutative Banach function spaces*, Math. Z. **201** (1989), 583-597.
- [6] P.G. Dodds, B. de Pagter, E.M. Semenov and F.A. Sukochev, *Symmetric functionals and singular traces*, Positivity **2** (1998), 45-75.
- [7] K.J. Dykema, T. Figiel, G. Weiss and M. Wodzicki, *The commutator structure of operator ideals*, Adv. Math. (to appear).
- [8] K.J. Dykema and N.J. Kalton, *Spectral characterization of sums of commutators II*, J. reine angew. Math. **504** (1998), 127-137.
- [9] T. Fack, *Sur la notion de valeur caractéristique*, J. Operator Theory **7** (1982), 307-333.

- [10] T. Fack and P. de la Harpe, *Sommes de commutateurs dans les algèbres de von Neumann finies continues*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble **30** (1980), 49-73.
- [11] T. Fack and H. Kosaki, *Generalized s -numbers of τ -measurable operators*, Pacific J. Math. **123** (1986), 269-300.
- [12] T. Figiel and N.J. Kalton, Symmetric linear functionals on function spaces, in *Function spaces, interpolation theory and related topics*, M. Cwikel, M. Englis, A. Kufner, L.-E. Persson and G. Sparr, editors, de Gruyter, 2002, pp. 311-332.
- [13] B. Fuglede and R. Kadison, *Determinant theory in finite factors*, Ann. Math. **55** (1952), 520-530.
- [14] A. Grothendieck, *Seminaire Bourbaki, 1954/55, Textes des conférences, Exp. 113*, second corrected edition, Secrétariat mathématique, Paris, 1959.
- [15] D. Guido and T. Isola, *Singular traces on semifinite von Neumann algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **134** (1995), 451-485.
- [16] V. Kaftal and G. Weiss, *Traces, ideals, and arithmetic means*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **99** (2002), 7356-7360.
- [17] N.J. Kalton, *Trace-class operators and commutators*, J. Funct. Anal. **86** (1989), 41-74.
- [18] N.J. Kalton, *Spectral characterization of sums of commutators I*, J. reine angew. Math. **504** (1998), 115-125.
- [19] N.J. Kalton, *Traces and characteristic determinants*, Rend. Circ. Math. Palermo **56** (1998), 59-68.
- [20] F.J. Murray and J. von Neumann, *On rings of operators*, Ann. of Math. **37** (1936), 116-229.
- [21] E. Nelson, *Notes on non-commutative integration*, J. Funct. Anal. **15** (1974), 103-116.
- [22] C. Pearcy and D. Topping, *On commutators in ideals of compact operators*, Michigan J. Math. **18** (1971), 247-252.
- [23] I.E. Segal, *A non-commutative extension of abstract integration*, Ann. of Math. **57** (1953), 401-457; correction **58** (1953), 595-596.
- [24] A. Ströh and G.P. West, *τ -compact operators affiliated to a semifinite von Neumann algebra*, Proc. R. Ir. Acad. **93A** (1993), 73-86.
- [25] G. Weiss, *Commutators of Hilbert-Schmidt operators II*, Integral Equations Operator Theory, **3/4** (1980), 574-600.
- [26] G.P. West, *Ideals of τ -measurable operators*, Quaestiones Math. **18** (1995), 333-344.

K.J. DYKEMA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE STATION TX 77843-3368, USA

E-mail address: Ken.Dykema@math.tamu.edu

N.J. KALTON, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA MO 65211, USA

E-mail address: nigel@math.missouri.edu